REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action dated on March 11, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

In this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended editorially. Claims 1-8 are now pending in the application and claim 1 remains the independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the amended application respectfully is requested. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended editorially to clearly define "the set of phase data" and "the set of frame data". Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 meets the requirements for 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lasneski (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,205, hereinafter "Lasneski"). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the cited reference.

It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a single reference, the reference must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all features of the claim at issue. It is respectfully submitted that the Lasneski reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all features of claim 1 for the following reasons.

Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, recites that:

1. A method for automatically adjusting the quality of a display, the method comprising the steps of:

providing a set of frame data with pixel data and a set of display timings including a horizontal synchronal signal, wherein the set of display timings has a display resolution;

auto-phasing the set of frame data to obtain a set of phase data based on the horizontal synchronal signal; and

determining whether to perform H-positioning in order to display a frame corresponding to the frame data in the center of the screen of the display by comparing the display resolution with a set of standard resolutions; and

when the display resolution corresponds to one of the set of standard resolutions, automatically H-positioning to obtain a set of H-pos (Horizontal position) data to display the frame corresponding to the frame data in the center of the screen of the display and storing the set of H-pos data.

(Emphasis added.) It is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over the Lasneski reference for at least the reason that Lasneski fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the features highlighted of claim 1, as amended.

In particular, the Lasneski reference recites that "**[D]educed horizontal resolution, if unknown, is determined** by microcontroller 16 counting the number of H_{SYNC} pulses 104 in the video frame to determine a vertical resolution count and then finding deduced horizontal resolution from a standard display resolution table, such as one represented below in Table 1" (column 8, lines 13-18), which the Office Action relied on as allegedly teaching "comparing the

display resolution with a set of standard resolutions", recited in claim 1. In contrast, claim 1 recites "**determining whether to perform H-positioning in order to display a frame corresponding to the frame data in the center of the screen of the display by comparing the display resolution with a set of standard resolutions**". Thus, Lasneski does not disclose, teach, or even suggest that "**determining whether to perform H-positioning in order to display a frame corresponding to the frame data in the center of the screen of the display by comparing the display resolution with a set of standard resolutions**". In addition, the Office Action relied on Lasneski's teaching that "**[I]f the feedback pulse frequency does not equal the H_{SYNC} pulse frequency, the phase difference signal causes the pixel clock frequency generated by VCO 50 to deviate such that the feedback pulse frequency from counter 22 deviates toward the H_{SYNC} pulse frequency**" (column 9, lines 12-15), for an alleged teaching of the claimed "automatically H-positioning to obtain a set of H-pos data." However, the Lasneski reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest that "**when the display resolution corresponds to one of the set of standard resolutions, automatically H-positioning to obtain a set of H-pos (Horizontal position) data to display the frame corresponding to the frame data in the center of the screen of the display and storing the set of H-pos data**", recited in amended claim 1. Thus, the Lasneski reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all features recited in amended claim 1. It is accordingly submitted that amended claim 1 is patentable over the Lasneski reference for at least the reason that the cited reference fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all features recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, the Office Action (page 3, lines 6-10) states:

> While Lasneski teaches that the H-positioning data is compared with standard resolutions, there is no teachings that H-positioning is stored when the display resolution corresponds to one of the set of standard resolution, however it is taught that only the standard resolution entries are required, only if the resolution being employed by the multimedia source is unknown (see column 8, lines 40-44).

However and in contrast to the interpretation of claim 1 set forth in the Office Action, claim 1, as amended, recites that "**determining whether to perform H-positioning in order to display a frame corresponding to the frame data in the center of the screen of the display by comparing the display resolution with a set of standard resolutions**" and "**when the display resolution corresponds to one of the set of standard resolutions, automatically H-positioning to obtain a set of H-pos (Horizontal position) data to display the frame corresponding to the frame data in the center of the screen of the display and storing the set of H-pos data**". Instead, Lasneski apparently teaches at column 8, lines 40-44 that **standard resolution entries are required for** determining **deduced horizontal resolution,** if the **resolution** being employed by the multimedia source is **unknown.** Thus, the cited passage (column 8, lines 40-44), as well as the above-mentioned passages (column 8, lines 13-18 and column 9, lines 12-15), notably provide no motivation or suggestion to modify the teachings of Lasneski to meet steps concerning **displaying the frame corresponding to the frame data in the center of the screen of the display**, as recited in claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no showing has been made of a suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of Lasneski to meet Applicant's independent claim 1.

Furthermore, consistent with the above discussions, it is respectfully submitted that the conclusion of obviousness set forth in the paragraph beginning at page 3, lines 14 of the Office

Action is unsupported. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over the Lasneski reference, and the rejection of claim 1 accordingly should be withdrawn.

It is, accordingly, also submitted that claims 2-8 are patentable over the cited reference and should be allowed for at least the reason that they are dependent from independent amended claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-8 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the application, with allowed claims 1-8, is in condition for allowance and such a Notice earnestly is requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

May 28, 2004
Date

Steven M. Rabin
Registration No. 29, 102
Rabin & Berdo, PC
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Tel. 202-371-8976